REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to a first Official Action on a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). The first Official Action of this RCE rejects Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 14, 19, 22-29, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by newly-cited U.S. Patent No. 6,377,810 to Geiger et al. The Official Action then rejects Claims 3, 12, 20 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,810 to Ganesh; rejects Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 31 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064707 to McCann et al.; and rejects Claims 7 and 16 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0083183 to Pujare et al. As explained below, however, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Geiger, Ganesh, McCann and Pujare, taken individually or in any proper combination. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended various ones of the claims to further clarify the claimed invention (including cancelling Claims 2, 11 and 29), and added new Claims 34-36 to recite further patentable aspects of the present invention. In view of the amendments the claims, the newly-added claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

A. Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 14, 19, 22-29, 32 and 33 are Patentable

The first Official Action rejects Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 14, 19, 22-29, 32 and 33 as being anticipated by Geiger. According to one aspect of the claimed invention, as reflected by amended independent Claim 10, a system for controlling access to an event includes first and second network entities, and an event server maintaining an event. The first network entity is configured to control access to event-based information available within a network and associated with the event. In this regard, the first network entity is configured to receive, from the second network entity, a request to access event-based information, where as amended, the second network entity may be unknown to the first network entity prior to the first network entity receiving the request. Support for this amendment may be found at least at page 3, lines 1-4, and page 4, lines 21-25, of the present application.

The first network entity is configured to receive consent to access the event-based information associated with the event, automatically create an authorization in response to receiving the consent, and thereafter transmit the authorization. The second network entity is configured to receive the authorization, and thereafter transmit a subscription message. The subscription message includes the authorization and an event package describing the event-based information. Finally, the event server is configured to receive the subscription message, and thereafter determine whether to accept the subscription message based upon the authorization.

In contrast to amended independent Claim 10, Geiger does not teach or suggest a system for controlling access to an event whereby the entity controlling access to event-based information (first network entity) receives a request to access that information from another entity (second network entity) unknown to the first network entity prior to receiving the request. Geiger may disclose a mobile device granting a requesting entity to receive location information for that device. But Geiger does not teach or suggest that the requesting entity is unknown to the mobile device before the mobile device receives a request for its location information. In this regard, Geiger discloses that its mobile device and requesting entity are preferably members of the same security domain. That is, Geiger discloses that the request from the requesting entity includes a digital signature of the requesting entity, and that the digital signature is preferably from a security domain in which the user of the mobile device is a member. In contrast to amended independent Claim 10 in which the second network entity is unknown to the first network entity prior to a request from the second network entity, Geiger therefore discloses that its requesting entity is known to the mobile device prior to a request from the requesting entity.

1. Subscription Message

In further contrast to amended independent Claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that Geiger does not teach or suggest a subscription message including an authorization and event package describing event-based information. The Official Action appears to equate the recited subscription message to a request for location information from the requesting entity to the location server disclosed by Geiger. Applicant respectfully disagrees, however, and submits that a subscription message does not necessarily correspond to a simple request for information, at

least for the fact that a subscription may permit a user to receive information at multiple instances without multiple corresponding requests. This fact is further clarified by newly-added Claims 34-36, which recite that the subscription message includes a positive, non-zero expiration time (although it should be understood that at least independent Claims 10, 19 and 28 contemplate a subscription message that may or may not have a positive, non-zero expiration time).

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 10, and by dependency Claims 12-18, 23, 26 and 34, is patentably distinct from Geiger. Applicant also respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 1, 19 and 28 recite subject matter similar to that of independent Claim 10, including the aforementioned consent and automatic authorization-creation features with receipt of a request from a network entity unknown prior to the request. As such, Applicant also respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 1, 19 and 28, and by dependency Claims 3-9, 20-22, 24, 25, 27, 30-33, 35 and 36, are also patentably distinct from Geiger for at least the reasons given above.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 14, 19, 22-29, 32 and 33 as being anticipated by Geiger is overcome.

B.   *Claims 3, 12, 20 and 30 are Patentable*

The Official Action rejects Claims 3, 12, 20 and 30 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in Ganesh. As explained above, independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28, and by dependency Claims 3-9, 12-18, 20-27 and 30-36, are patentably distinct from Geiger. Applicant respectfully submits that Ganesh does not cure the deficiencies of Geiger. That is, even considering Ganesh, neither Geiger nor Ganesh, taken individually or in any proper combination, teach or suggest the aforementioned controlling access to an event whereby the entity controlling access to event-based information (first network entity) receives a request to access that information from another entity (second network entity) unknown to the first network entity prior to receiving the request, as per amended independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28, and by dependency Claims 3-9, 12-18, 20-27 and 30-36, are patentably distinct from Geiger and Ganesh, taken individually or in any proper

combination.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 3, 12, 20 and 30 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of Ganesh is overcome.

C. Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 31 are Patentable

The Official Action rejects Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 31 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of McCann. As explained above, independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28, and by dependency Claims 3-9, 12-18, 20-27 and 30-36, are patentably distinct from Geiger. Applicant respectfully submits that McCann does not cure the deficiencies of Geiger. That is, even considering McCann, neither Geiger nor McCann, taken individually or in any proper combination, teach or suggest the aforementioned controlling access to an event whereby the entity controlling access to event-based information (first network entity) receives a request to access that information from another entity (second network entity) unknown to the first network entity prior to receiving the request, as per amended independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28, and by dependency Claims 3-9, 12-18, 20-27 and 30-36, are patentably distinct from Geiger and McCann, taken individually or in any proper combination.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 31 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of McCann is overcome.

D. Claims 7 and 16 are Patentable

The Official Action rejects Claims 7 and 16 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of Pujare. As explained above, independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28, and by dependency Claims 3-9, 12-18, 20-27 and 30-36, are patentably distinct from Geiger. Applicant respectfully submits that Pujare does not cure the deficiencies of Geiger. That is, even considering Pujare, neither Geiger nor Pujare, taken individually or in any proper combination, teach or suggest the aforementioned controlling access to an event whereby the entity controlling access to event-based information (first network entity) receives a request to access that information from another entity (second network entity) unknown to the first network entity prior to receiving the

request, as per amended independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, 19 and 28, and by dependency Claims 3-9, 12-18, 20-27 and 30-36, are patentably distinct from Geiger and Pujare, taken individually or in any proper combination.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claims 7 and 16 as being unpatentable over Geiger, in view of Pujare is overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments the claims, the newly-added claims and the remarks presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew T. Spence
Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30757626v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT &
TRADEMARK OFFICE ON APRIL 24, 2008.